

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
December 18, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on December 18, 2003, via conference call. DWR provided a central location at a conference room in Sacramento, and Kevin Zeitler graciously allowed use of his office conference room and phone in Oroville for those wishing to convene there.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Proposed Final RSWG Resource Action Matrix
Attachment 4	Resource Action Sub-list "A": RAs Proposed for PDEA Analysis
Attachment 5	RA Sub-list "B": RAs NOT Proposed for PDEA Analysis
Attachment 6	RA Sub-list "S": "Settlement" Issues, NOT for PDEA Analysis
Attachment 7	RA Sub-list "T": "Trails" Issues, Will be Analyzed Generally
Attachment 8	Comments on Resource Action List from Joint Powers Authority
Attachment 9	Comments on Resource Action List from Butte County
Attachment 10	DWR Written Response to JPA Comments
Attachment 11	DWR Written Response to Butte County Comments

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Action Items – November 20, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the November 20, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

Action Item #R95:	Send comments on resource action lists to DWR, finalize resource action lists and distribute to RSWG, and present lists to the Plenary Group. All comments submitted to DWR will receive written responses.
Status:	Comments on the proposed resource action lists have been received by DWR since the last RSWG meeting and DWR has responded to these comments in writing. The planned presentation to the Plenary Group was not made due to scheduling conflicts for key DWR staff. However, the proposed final resource action lists to be presented to the Plenary Group have been completed and delivered to the PDEA Team. Some changes have been made since the versions distributed at last month's meeting; details on those changes and responses to the comments received by DWR are provided below.
Action Item #R96:	Follow-up with DWR on resource action tracking system.
Status:	The Facilitator explained that there is an internal master tracking system for proposed resource actions in place. It is unclear if and when the system would be

made available to the public. Additional information regarding this issue may be made available at the next Plenary Group meeting.

Action Item #R97:

Status:

Follow-up on the availability of a revised process diagram.

The Facilitator reported that a revised process diagram was presented at the Plenary Group meeting in December 2003 and will be attached to those meeting notes when posted on the Project Website. The process diagram is also available by contacting DWR directly. Further discussion on project processes will likely take place at the next Plenary Group meeting in January.

Review Final Sorting of Resource Action Lists

The scheduled presentation of proposed resource actions recommended for further analysis by the RSWG was not made to the Plenary Group in December 2003 as originally planned due to scheduling conflicts for key DWR staff. The delay provided an opportunity to further review the proposed resource action lists (Attachments 3 through 7) and discuss comments received by DWR since the last RSWG meeting. Presentation to the Plenary Group was rescheduled for January 27, 2004.

DWR received comments on the proposed resource action lists from two stakeholder groups: the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) via the Dangermond Group and Butte County (Attachments 8 and 9, respectively). These two comment letters were reviewed in detail with the RSWG.

Doug Rischbieter (DWR) reviewed the five issues raised in the JPA letter, reiterating the points contained in his written (Email) response (Attachment 10). The first issue deals with the proposed tribal cultural center. Doug explained that resource actions related to a cultural facility in the RSWG matrix remain on the B list because this issue is being addressed in depth in the Cultural Work Group. The second issue relates to the proposed DWR information center (LF-6). The analysis of this proposal is dependent on the Needs Analysis, and was moved from the B list to the Settlement list. The third issue addresses the need for various "gateway" facilities (LF-6, -7, -9). These proposals are considered more appropriate as settlement issues therefore; they were moved from the B list to the Settlement list. The fourth issue addresses the re-establishment of a boat launch at the Afterbay outlet. Doug explained that the Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW) is planning boat launch improvements at a location upstream of the outlet in 2004 that include a paved access road serving the facility (paving will be funded by DWR). Since DBW has already considered environmental effects of this action, the RSWG proposal is appropriately included on the B list. The last issue deals with the development of a maintenance yard at the Lime Saddle area. This facility is considered important for any type of expansion in the area. The RSWG agreed that this proposal would remain on the B list because it is not appropriate to analyze it as a separate project but noted that it would be added to any proposed resource action related to major additions in the Lime Saddle area, several of which are on the A list.

The Butte County letter included five issues related to the RSWG that were discussed by the participants and replied to in writing (Attachment 11). Four additional issues not related to the RSWG were forwarded to the appropriate DWR staff for consideration. The first recreation-related issue in the County letter reiterated which resource actions are particularly important to the County and requested that all be included in the A list. This comment was noted but none of these resource actions were moved, for various reasons. Doug again reminded the RSWG that none of the resource actions will be "dropped" from potential consideration and they will all be listed in the PDEA, although very little if any analysis will be included in the April 2004 PDEA document. The second issue deals with the proposed warm-water swimming facility at Loafer Creek; the RSWG discussed what types of facilities might be desired (i.e., on or off the reservoir, or traditional swimming pool) and some factors relating to the relative cost and feasibility of each option. This resource action remains on the A list and will be characterized by several different options that

need to be evaluated by DWR and the PDEA Team. The third issue noted the lack of socioeconomics resource actions on any of the lists. Doug clarified that the omission of these proposed resource actions was an oversight and most socioeconomic-related proposals are now included on the Settlement list. Proposals not on the Settlement list (SO-15, -22, -24, -25, and -26) have been added to the B list because they are considered to be outside the scope of relicensing. The fourth issue deals with land acquisition proposals. Doug noted that most land acquisition proposals will be part of the settlement process and as such, they are included on the Settlement list; a few acquisition proposals are on the B list. These proposals will not receive environmental analysis in the PDEA. Butte County disagreed with this approach and feels that land acquisition proposals should be included on the A list. The fifth issue raised by Butte County questions the development of a master tracking system for proposed resource actions. The development of a tracking system was initially suggested in the Plenary Group so that proposals would not get lost in the relicensing process. An internal system is in place to track the fate of all resource actions but no plan is in place to make the tracking system available to the collaborative. However, there is a master list of resource actions that have resource action identification forms completed; this list has been shared with the collaborative.

Representatives from Butte County reiterated their desire for cross-resource coordination when evaluating proposed resource actions. Doug noted that potential cross-resource effects continue to be discussed among RAMs and will be considered in the PDEA. Additionally, cross-resource task forces may be initiated to discuss specific proposed resource actions if warranted.

TRT Update

Tom Wegge (TCW Economics) provided an update on recent activities of the Socioeconomics Technical Review Team (TRT). The most recent TRT meeting was held in November, 2003. Two main issues were discussed at the meeting: the economic-fiscal model and the property value analysis. He explained that the nearly-completed economic-fiscal model represents the primary analytical tool that will be used in the implementation of SP-R18 and R19. The property value study examines the relationship between lake levels and proximity to the lake with property values in the Project area. Preliminary results were presented to the TRT and several subsequent steps are being taken based on TRT recommendations prior to finalizing the analysis. This analysis, along with the description of the recreation and tourism economy in Oroville, will be part of the Phase 2 Background Report that serves R18 and R19. It is anticipated that these reports may be distributed to the RSWG in April or May 2004, after DWR and TRT review.

Other

The RSWG discussed future release of study reports and a schedule for study report review. The goal is to average approximately 3-4 reports for RSWG review over the next several months. The RSWG requested that a schedule be developed to facilitate the scheduling of study report review; this will be distributed at the next RSWG meeting. It is anticipated that R2, R16, the Phase 2 Socioeconomics Background Report, and possibly R11 will be available at the January 2004 RSWG meeting. At this time there does not appear to be a need to schedule additional meetings to facilitate the review of study reports.

Next Steps

The RSWG agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, January 29, 2003
Time: 6:00 to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the RSWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #R98: Distribute schedule for release of study reports.

Responsible: DWR

Due Date: January 29, 2004